UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/768,658 | 02/02/2004 | Kyung-chul Nam | Q78895 | 8255 |
| 23373 SUGHRUE MI | 7590 03/30/200 ON, PLLC | EXAMINER | | |
| 2100 PENNSY | LVANIA AVENUE, N | HOSSAIN, FARZANA E | | |
| SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2424 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/30/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/768,658 | NAM ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| FARZANA E. HOSSAIN | 2424 | |

| | FARZANA E. HOSSAIN | 2424 | |
|---|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>09 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Action on event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraorder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better | isideration and/or search (see NOTw); | ΓE below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12) | | ected claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | · | | , |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) | · | • | _ |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | r be entered and an e. | pianation of |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | • | |
| See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (| | Condition for alloware | se because. |
| 13. Other: | | | |
| /Christopher Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424 | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 13 has a clarification that changes the scope of the claim.

The language of "on a television" versus "in a television" changes performing elements of the claim for searching on a television to having the television having components perform the elements to search. The amendment requires further search and/or consideration. The proposed amendment would make Claim 13 similar to claim 6.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding Claim 6, the applicant argues that Zylka clearly indicated in paragraph 38 that a gateway may be a set top terminal (STT)/personal versatile recorder unit (PVR) (200) and that the television set is linked to the video audio inputs and therefore, the gateway or STT/PVR should not be assumed to be the TV set (Pages 6-7). The applicant argues that a television searching and classifying multimedia contents on its own is distinguished from Zylka having a gateway for searching and classifying the contents (Page 7). The applicant argues that Zylka does not disclose the predetermined execution program to be executed for the multimedia content file selected by the user based on a classified result is selected and the multimedia content file is displayed by executing the predetermined execution program (Page 7).

In response to the argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner did not state that Zylka disclosed a television comprising the elements. The office action on page 9 states "Zylka discloses a television (TV) and a set top terminal/personal video recorder (STT/PVR or STT or PVR) or gateway in (Figure 2, 300, Figure 1, Page 4, paragraph 0038) having a function of searching multimedia content (Page 5, paragraph 0051), the STT or gateway comprising." Sie was combined with Zylka to disclose a STT that can be integrated into the television (Page 16, paragraph 0171). Zylka clearly discloses a predetermined execution program displays the selected file as corresponding applications to user command performs features (Pages 1-2, paragraphs 0014-0016). Therefore, Zylka discloses wherein a predetermined program to be executed for a file selected by a user based on a classified result is selected and the file is displayed by executing the predetermined program (Page 3, paragraph 0033, Page 2, paragraphs 0016, 0018, Page 5, paragraph 0052, Page 1, paragraph 0014).

The applicants argue that the remaining cliams are patentable based on similar reasons to claim 6. See above respone.

2